

10. Comments on WWA.

1. WWA is very cumbersome to use, especially during complicated weather situations where multiple watches/warnings/advisories/statements are in effect. Upgrading and downgrading watch/warnings and advisories are not intuitive and often leads to problems. Forecasters at marine WFO's are also very frustrated as we are having to use multiple utilities to produce marine products. Currently, WWA can not utilize both marine and zone UGCs in products which is required in many of our products.
2. Still too clunky, but much better than in the past. No need to elaborate on problems, you already know them.
3. When it takes several pages of step-by-step instructions to go through every time you issue a produce, something is seriously wrong. Way too many "idiosyncrasies" to keep track of. We issue a lot of WSWs here in lake effect snow country, and even with abundant practice, the process of adjusting headlines is still very painful and time-consuming.
4. WWA is not intuitive. It requires a lot of maintenance and configuration is cumbersome. Forecasters have too jostle between short fuse software (WarnGen) product creation and Long Fuse (WWA) product creation when "1" all encompassing software would do. The Headline option is still a mystery. We spent many years with "NO" Marine capability and then when it was supposedly working we had difficulty configuring it, often requiring MDL support. To this day the Marine functionality is next to useless. Suggestion. Combine WWA and WarnGen. Your programming requirements in the end will be reduced and our learning curve. And most important, make all the National Centers use it to coordinate with the field. Having TPC, NCEP, SPC all on "1" platform WITH the field would improve national coordination and improve public service.
5. Finally, a chance to re-recommend things I was pushing for 5 years ago! :) WWA should allow correction and amendment. WWA should also allow multiple geographic segments within a single WWA hazard (e.g., segments in a WSW with differing snowfall accumulations), which can also be rearranged in followup statements. WWA should allow hazard upgrade or downgrade (e.g., Winter Weather Advisory to Winter Storm Warning). Those are just a few items that come to mind.
6. The biggest drawback to WWA that I have, is that the forecaster is unable to tell at a glance, the complete picture regarding watches, warnings and advisories along with the different timing associated with each. When you need WWA the most, during busy weather situations, it comes up short to let you truly know what is going on. As a result, unless you have time to investigate each surrounding WFOs, WWA is largely ignored.
7. Too many little software work arounds to remember. It isn't that intuitive.
8. Without being too specific on details the WWA as it stands now appears developed more for the programming aspects than ease (logical) of use. The flow of actions to create a product is poor and does not follow a logic which most field personnel would fall into. The use of WWA is often under stress and in busy situations. It is imperative that the message composition flow be as smooth and intuitive as possible. For example, creating a WSW with multiple warning/watch types is an exercise in futility unless one had done the process repeatedly in the past or pays close attention to the process as it exists today. One small deviation from an illogical flow of clicks can potentially destroy and effort or lead to frustration. Perhaps an information GUI box to prompt to the next step might be useful if such a scheme needs to be. Perhaps the most obvious problem is updating an already existing product. The system knows it's there by the bars at the bottom of the page...why can't the product be updated?? It seems there is also an inordinate amount of obscure procedures to delete a product....having to call it up etc. Of course the notion of being able to practice this mess without creating a sendable product .ie. having a practice mode that works...does not appear to be a priority even though if one were to let slip a practice product into the world it would be a big boo-boo!!

9. WWA is simply not sufficient to the task. It has many problems which are well known. I know some of them will be fixed eventually, but they should have been fixed long ago before WWA became such a major part of operations. As the WWA focal point, I feel that the admin gui is not very user friendly. Also, there is too much noise on the wwa info list, and I don't think most people have time to sort through all of the messages and threads to find the useful information buried among the repetitive FAQs and answers.
10. There needs to be the ability to do a follow-up for what WWA thinks are unissued products, which are actually issued but not with the text display that was created when the create text box was selected.
11. It's just not easy to learn. Nor is it forgiving--particularly if you don't write something to the database properly the first time. At times it has been buggy--last spring it inserted improper watch numbers into products (this was fixed). These problems are greatly exacerbated by the fact that you use WWA when high-quality performance is most needed.
12. I appreciate the time and effort put into developing this software by the programmers. However, it is very un-intuitive and klunky (i.e., too many mouse clicks and/or screen/menu changes to achieve a desired task) to use, especially when dealing with multiple highlights and making changes to highlights. While XNOW is an easier program to use, it too suffers from a bit of klunkiness. In contrast, WARNGEN is quite intuitive and easy to use. If WWA could evolve down the WARNGEN path of being intuitive and easy to use, we would adopt it quickly.
13. The whole process is still fairly slow, not real intuitive, but it's now pretty reliable and works OK. The good thing about WarnGen and XNOW is that they do well for what they are supposed to, are quick to use. I fear that a combined headline dissemination tool would be a huge, un-user-friendly monster, and this would not be acceptable. Comments on WWA
14. I would like to see more field testing before version releases. It seems like problematic DRs pop up with every other release or so.
15. Although I am not completely satisfied with WWA, it has improved immensely. It is only now coming to a point of really being useful and we will be making more use of it operationally.
16. no user friendly...not easy to correct mistakes or change mind late (which often happens in the world of weather). Designed for the database, not the forecaster. Basically just a bad piece of software that I don't like to use.
17. It has been hard to get comfortable with WWA with not only the build updated to WWA, but also AWIPS updates which usually corrupt our WWA. By the time our focal point reloads WWA (which takes some time), I have to go back to our manual to remember all the key points.

18. Its like an SLR...too many gadgets that are infrequently used and forgotten. Followups are not necessarily easy. If I run into problems, I basically cancel the issued product and start over. We are first responders... to have complex systems to generate statements is questionable and a lot of this must be for in-house requirements. Bottom line...the external customer is most imp! Many of us are highly dissatisfied with WWA. This business about PROPOSED products is hardly used. The only value of a proposed product is from SPC... otherwise we dont use that... we talk and we use AFD! Thats just another wstn window we have to have occupied and not used for analysis. Not only that, but that we have constantly be using multi systems to issue..including riverpro, WWA, WARNGEN. We should have stayed with XNOW... new doesnt mean necessarily better...there is much documentation to support this assertion... I'll be glad to forward some from the medical field. There is far too much implementation of buggy software that is NOT effecting improved ops. Our complaints are falling on deaf ears... and I personally believe this is abuse of our personnel, many of whom are conscientious and dedicated to fast response and are being slowed by software issues. In the end, not only should computerization allow for more product generation, but it should make life easier... that is not the case with WWA! Its good that you're surveying.
19. Extremely difficult to use. NOT intuitive. The other day had 7 counties in a snow advisory. Wanted to cancel one county out but continue with the other 6. Neither me or the other forecaster could figure out how to do this. It should be not be that hard to use. After I typed out the snow advisory, I did not send it yet but expected the headline to be included in the appropriate zone grouping. It was not. What is the purpose of the WWA if the headline is not picked up. I purposely did the snow advisory in wwa BEFORE I divided up the zone grouping. There are time we I set up the begin and expiration time, and then when it spits out totally ignored my begin time to make it the present time as the beginning. Basically, the present wwa needs to be junked and start over with a new design. It needs to be easy to use, easy to amend, easy to edit, easy to change your mind.
20. We are using WWA to generate the HWO product at this time. Seems like you have to jump through a few hoops to complete this task.
21. WWA is not user friendly. Forecasters here have great difficulty maintaining a clean database, especially when you have segmented products and then these products must be further modified/upgraded. I recently revised some instructions for using WWA. There ends up being over 30 steps a forecaster must go through to reconfigure a segmented product. When time is precious during these significant events, this much manipulation is unacceptable. Good training would also help. I am involved in training and setup but do not feel I have even been trained thoroughly enough. Something similar to the teletraining that was given for SCAN when it it first came online would be good.
22. Highly counter-intuitive, complicated, inflexible, too easy to make fatal mistakes, unclear terminology ("clear", "cancel", "delete") cannot accept warning products created outside WWA. Suggest: 1. recognize warning products generated outside WWA 2. simplify conversion of watch to warning, etc 3. automatically sequence segmented products, i.e., cancel, warning, advisory, watch 3. clarify color scheme 4. "undo" feature (vitaly needed) 5. get rid of the time "wheels" 5. provide compact, understandable, and complete documentation
23. It is awkward to create products, especially multi-segemented ones. You also cannot change the product UGC expiration time without rendering the Follow Up feature inoperative. Forecasters should be able to set the UGC expiration time as they need. Xnow is better tool for product preparation, ignoring the need to intersire coordination and automatic interaction with IFPS.
24. SINCE WE ARE STAFFED WITH FIVE LEADS, FOUR JOURNEYS AND THREE HMTS MY STAFF AND I DO A LOT OF INTERACTION WITH WWA FOR THE FORECASTERS. MAINLY DOING NOWCASTs, BUT I ALSO USE IT FOR MY DROUGHT AND FLOOD OUTLOOK PRODUCTS AS NEEDED. I DO LIKE IT AND IT IS A VERY USEFUL TOOL, HOWEVER I THINK ONE SOFTWARE PACKAGE TO DO ALL THE WARNING AND STATMENT PRODUCTS (PUBLIC AND HYDRO) WOULD BE OF BETTER VALUE AND LESS OF AN AWIPS RESOURCE HOGGER???

25. Still is some confusion on product expiration time vs message expiration time. This especially comes into play on follow up messages, and I've noticed it negatively impacts SAF as a result (i.e. same headline repeats itself). ... Need to be able to recall previous versions of the product.
26. Although I am able to use WWA fairly well, and do not run into significant problems while using it, my forecasters complain often about its usability. Some of their problems are due to lack of understanding on how certain features work, but I believe many of their complaints are due to the simple fact that the application is not particularly intuitive. Since GFE has quickly become the central focus of our operations (with nearly all routine text products in our office being produced via GFE text formatters), it would be nice to have the WWA functionality for long fuse watches, warnings, and advisories incorporated into GFE via the inclusion of a headline grid. Smart tools within GFE could be used to populate the headline grid based on the weather conditions which are present in the grids (weather, snow accumulations, winds, etc...). In addition, this would allow for depiction of headlines over the actual areas where the hazardous conditions are expected to occur, rather than simply picking the geopolitical area defined by the county.
27. WWA is fine for initial issuances. It should be much better when dealing with changes and followups. In large part due to the latter, the feature which allows us to view what other offices have done is a great idea which hasn't yet reached maturity.
28. It is cumbersome to use. It is too slow. And there are too many different applications. Also WWA does not work well when two people are trying to use it at one...It crashes. The WWA system is junk and the people in MDL need to spend some time in a forecast office and ask people what they want before they pass on outdated software to the field!!!
29. takes too long to start up menu items: hazard selection process is too confusing and cluttered with choices inability of nowcasts to retain previous verbiage (XNOW Does) marine integration is non-existent here at CHS after all this time
30. If WWA sticks around and is to be used nationally, maybe there could be some tele-training sessions. For that matter, whenever new software is introduced, maybe teletraining should be offered to introduce it.
31. WWA is not real intuitive on how to do more of the complicated procedures. e.g. extending clearing and canceling various segments. You know there is some problem if you show forecasters how to do a complicated downgrade/upgrade, they understand it then, but then can not do it by themselves a week later.
32. To me WWA seems to be an unstable application that should not be in the field in regular operational use. I view it as beta software. It is especially difficult to use with segmenting, different expiration times, etc. I do not have any problem with the general "philosophical" approach of this software. Perhaps if it worked like IFPS, which is easy to use and see surrounding areas, it would be better. Or if it worked like X-NOW. As things stand right now, for a complicated situation, I revert to X-NOW anyway. Regional policy notwithstanding (we "have to" use WWA), my job is to help the public and save lives.
33. NOT USER FRIENDLY IN SEGMENTED WATCHES/WARNINGS...MUST CLOSE COMPOSER WINDOW EVERYTIME. AWKWARD TO USE FOR UPDATES...EXTENTIONS.
34. WWA is not very user friendly. It is difficult and time consuming to upgrade or cancel parts of a watch/warning/advisory, and to re-arrange counties in an existing segment of a watch/warning/advisory. It was very easy and quick to perform these tasks in XNOW so WWA has resulted in an increased workload.
35. Some streamlining would be helpful. Also it would help if the software were more forgiving when you need to make corrections/cancellations. It doesn't always work well with the interface with IFPS. At times a WWA product is cancelled and the headline remains (when it's cancelled early).

36. It is very difficult to use. I am a computer geek and the WWA interface is about as bad as it gets. It gets the job done, but it takes too much time and is too cumbersome to change your current headlines.
37. We typically avoid using WWA when possible. The interface is clunky, and could use a dose of the "KISS" principle. Merge the Monitor and Geo-viewer. Make practice sessions work. Make corrections to Hazards possible. Flexibility like this will make it more forgiving in practice situations, making it easier to "play" with so we are more familiar/comfortable with it. When cancelling or clearing a hazard, remembering which counties to select/deselect is not intuitive, and in the text product, makes a new segment. It should make a new row in the monitor, so that cancellations of parts of products can be more easily and intuitively combined with other groups. When a product is issued, WWA should be more flexible in it's ability to recognize the text product as an "unissued" product in it's database, and make the necessary changes. Also, should a text product come in that matches a possible product in it's database, it should have a way to input that product into it's database, whether initially created by WWA or not. If needed, it could request input from the forecaster, perhaps using fxa announce to indicate that it needs this input, and the forecaster could then open WWA, and give it the further information that it needs.
38. It's still "clumsy" to use and does not enhance coordination/collaboration. A much simpler/user friendly interface could be developed to improved forecaster abilities to issue WWA's.
39. The program is overcomplicated and counter-intuitive to use. It's hard to imagine a much simpler interface could not be devised. XNOW is a beautiful program and we used to do such things not all that long ago. I would gladly trade a little extra typing (manually entering "winter storm warning for...." in one area, "winter weather advisory for..." in another...) in an easy to use program for the klunky interface WWA offers. Then a program could be devised that can go out and strip off the valid times from all our watches, warnings, statements etc. and then display them in some kind of program that looks like WWA. From what I understand, WWA was invented as a coordination tool. With the invention of WWE and blast up calls and the kinds of office-to-office coordination calls that always have and will take place, I don't see the need for anything as complicated and hard to use as WWA. I vote for keeping it SIMPLE. In the fantasy world where WWA is killed and redesigned, I would like to suggest a feature where we can actually click on one of the areas/products displayed in the program and actually have the warning/watch/advisory/now (whatever) issued pop up in a new window.
40. The lack of ability to retain text in future products is a problem. Also the software is not easy to use and if used infrequently requires continual retraining.
41. The WWA needs to be made like most commercial software. That is it should have a standardized setup GUI. It should also have a Help menu item which documents how to use it, and configure it.
42. Earlier versions were poorly documented. Any errors made on issuing a product means starting the entire product over again. Wwa needs to have a practice mode. This would also greatly help the focal points out to see if the product will work properly.
43. I avoid it as much as possible. It takes too much effort to get it to do what you want it to do. Hardware/software should make the job easier, quicker, more efficient. You should not have to think about it as you use it. It should be intuitive and logical. If more than a small percentage of people are having difficulties with it then that should tell you that it is poorly designed/written software.
44. Just way to complicated. The X-now model should be followed.
45. WWA could be vastly improved by making it more user friendly without all the caveats (i.e. if you don't issue a product within so many minutes of creating it, WWA won't recognize the product in the GEO Viewer...and when that happens, when you go to update said product, WWA comes back with something like "must issue original product first").

46. One of the problems with WWA is that the display option of WWA is fine. It is done on the web by NWS and private companys. The separation of the display and the product creation needs to be done. There are so many restrictions that are unnecessary that WWA creates more work then needs to be done. The biggest problem is that many of the options have to be done in a specific order such as expiration time. Once you hit the create the text you are no longer allowed to change expiration times. It would be nice that the expiration time can be changed at the end of the process.
47. NWR formatters and NWR messages from other offices need to be improved.
48. WWA was a disaster from the start. Operational field personnel should have been consulted before the program was developed. This program rarely works as promised and is difficult to use. This and other software deployed lately have resulted in a forecast taking nearly 3 times longer to complete.
49. WWA is simply not intuitive to use. If you have a single headline that is in effect for 12 hours -- then WWA works fine to issue, update, and cancel/expire. However, if (as is most often the case in Michigan for 4-5 months/year) you have multiple headlines covering multiple time periods -- then WWA is a hinderance. Some headlines are going up, while others are being cancelled, and still others are being downgraded. The GUI interface needs to be more operationally friendly, simple, and intuitive -- so as to handle the above situations.
50. WWA is clunky and is about the most non-intuitive software I've ever had to use. I can go months without using Xnow and can use it quickly and successfully. After two years, I STILL have to refer to instructions for using WWA. The graphic is rarely used for any purpose, mainly because it is often incorrect. Other coordination methods are more reliable. Updates (follow-ups) are difficult and time consuming, and I often end up with incorrect product or event expiration times. When it does work, I use it only to generate the headers, and to update the graphic. I cut and paste the written produc into the empty product. Sometimes follow-up doesn't work, and I have to cancel the product and start again. Proposed mode is rarely used and should be removed. We use WWA most in active weather when we can least afford frustration and lost time, and it almost always results in both.
51. In all practicality, this is NOT a user friendly system for which to PRACTICE on. We should be able to get into this system and create practice products at any time without worrying about how it will impact the forecasters or other offices.
52. This system is very awkward. If you need to update by changing times or counties, it's better just to start over with a new product instead of updating as directed.
53. WWA is cumbersome to use. I can usually get it to work, but it sometimes requires you to be "creative" with the procedures to get the product the way you want.
54. When making changes to edited text this tends to break the links into the WWA portion that keeps track of the warnings. I was unable to subdivide a section (3 zones combined in a previous message that I want to make into 2 or 3 seperate sections) without breaking the links.
55. It is about the worst program I have ever used. It is extremely un-user friendly and it is way too confusing to use. Keep it simple!!!
56. Operations application was not the FIRST priority when this tool was developed. It is very time consuming and not user friendly. Convoluted would be the best definition I can think of.
57. The software is difficult to use and is not reliable. The initial issuance of a watch/warning/advisory is normally easy. The correction, updates and cancellations of the products is difficult and confusing. Winter weather is the worst, particularly in the Lake Effect Areas. The geographic regions are frequently changed in the watch/warning area and it is difficult to handle with WWA. The display of 30 products issued by surrounding

offices makes it difficult to determine which product is in effect. I often open WWA in busy weather and see dozens of products of listed. The filter function is useful but it is an extra step needed in a high stress situation. I don't care about a neighbors nowcast when I have warnings out.

58. Too many operational disruptions during critical operations. WWA is a moving target...there seem to be a continuous stream of software glitches/remedies.
59. 1) Either people are not using this software correctly, or it is just plain BAD. During winter events, surrounding offices have had over 20 current" products on WWA. There is no easy way to tell which ones are "current" and which ones have been replaced. Old products need to be cleared by each office...this obviously isn't being done. 2) The overlay of Watches, Warnings, Advisories etc from 5 surrounding offices all on one map is confusion to the nth degree. Radio button scheme to prioritize Watches, Warnings, etc not doing the job. Would almost suggest a 4 panel approach, with Advisories, Watches, Warnings and Other. Very tough to match an areal outline to the corresponding text bar with details. Often a hunt-and-peck approach to find the "right" product. 3) Follow-up and Clear applications are so cumbersome, most people usually cancel the old product and issue a new one. This may contribute to #1 above. 4)Confusing product valid time and expiration time paradigm."
60. Works acceptably when you originate a Watch/Warning/Advisory. Falls completely apart when you need to update and change areal coverage or timing of information in an ongoing Watch/Warning/Advisory.
61. From what I understand this is coming somewhere down the line, but the ability to upgrade/downgrade portions of WWAs is critical to its use.
62. This is one of the most pathetically designed pieces of software I have ever seen. I would say THE most pathetic - but there are others from MDL than rank up there - so I cannot say that. I strongly agree that the development of ONE single warning software program would be a good thing for the NWS but I cannot emphasize enough that MDL SHOULD NOT be responsible for writing that piece of software. They have PROVEN time and time again that they cannot design and build useful software and SHOULD NOT be entrusted with any more important pieces of software development. Should the NWS be stupid enough to entrust MDL with more development, NWS morale would be even further eroded, and I, personally, would redouble my efforts to get a job elsewhere, rather than be forced to use software that is so poorly designed.
63. It's slow and extremely cumbersome. It's as though someone set out to make a piece of software as difficult to use as possible. No surprise in the IFPS era I guess, but just one more 'twist of the knife', the knife sticking out of the backs of the forecasters who have to use all this 'buggy' and poorly designed stuff. There is hardly one piece of software we use in this era of 'modernization' that is easy to use and works well. XNOW was very good, but that is past. I'm sure you work very hard there and would like to have something that is well designed and perhaps even 'liked' by the users. But it seems the 'template' that was first used will not be allowed to die, as though you have so much time and energy invested that you will all die before admitting it is just plain horrible. This may sound like an attack but it is not. I don't write software because I've written some in Fortran, Basic and Visual Basic. I quit dabbling in it a few years ago because it's just plain frustrating, I sympathize with you. Don't understand this push to segment all warnings advisories, etc. It just makes it more difficult to issue anything here in the field. What's wrong with issuing a separate product for each hazard anyway? They are then simple, clear and to the point. Sure, not your decision either. Sometimes it feels the whole world is being insanely driven by technological demands, just because it can be done. Not very well however since we keep 'pushing the envelope' into areas where 'expertise' fails. With millions of lines of code, writing computer programs that can write, improve on and error check this code in 'excrutiating detail' seems to be the answer, but there is (of course) the danger that computers will 'take over'. From my limited perspective, this is already happening anyway, technology is driving us, not the other way around. But that is another issue. :-)

64. The current GUI is not very user-friendly particularly when writing test messages, draft products, and updates. The color coded map of issued products is confusing, mainly with regards to the terminology used. Reduce the six status levels to three: draft, issued, and expiring. Also need a cleaner, easier way to produce multi-segment products.
65. should NOT be merged with XNOW and WarnGen. So far WWA is still not very reliable software while XNOW and WarnGen consistently works without problems. I believe merging WWA with WarnGen could cause major problems during severe weather events if the program is too cumbersome to use...slow and possibly crashing during use.
66. It continues to have problems communicating with other applications. eg. IFPS
67. Headlines need to be managed better and incorporated into the new formatters. Need to have previous product text insertion capability. Needs more solid programming. People are afraid to use due to potential for program to crash or produce unexpected results. Changes to zone/county configurations should not result in having to start over. Fixes/changes need to come faster. Everyone (all offices) need to use it in order for it to be effective.
68. It's OK, now that we've had quite some time to get used to it, but it is not nearly as user friendly as XNOW, which hardly took any time to get proficient with. XNOW functionality needs to be merged in (especially the interface to select segments of products).
69. WWA has many pitfalls that must be avoided when using it. One mistake and you need to start again from scratch. This is a very time consuming process. All elements (location, timing, etc) must be decided on in advance. It does not allow for changes in thinking. For example, I have already formatted the product for Zones 1 and 2. A spotter called and now I should add zone 3. All the work I have already done needs to be canceled and the whole process started again. This takes too much time. We have stopped using it in our office for the faster more user friendly Xnow. WWA needs to be more flexible in order to be usable in a fast-paced rapidly-changing operational setting! It has some potential to be good, but as it is now it is an unacceptable program. If it could be like Xnow, but with the current capability of seeing neighboring offices highlights then you would have something.
70. The basic concept of WWA is a good one, but the actual outcome has been hard to use. The biggest problem has been with any post-editing in the WarnGen window usually leads to the product, at least in the GUI, as shown as unissued. From a programming standpoint this makes no sense. WWA should, after the statement, watch or warning has been issued, see what has been issued from the textdb and update the GUI accordingly, similar to what D2D does after a warning is sent out from WarnGen. The other problem with it is updating advisories, watches or warnings. It seems rather cumbersome and nonintuitive to go through the GUI, the way it is now, and upgrade, downgrade or cancel a statement. This happens quite a bit in a lake effect region where wind changes of 10 degrees dictate where the snow will fall and which county needs the warning. This software needs a complete revamping.
71. WWA replaced our locally developed warning/advisory software and was a step backwards. Our home grown" warning program used a simple menu, sub-menu approach that anyone could learn and master in less than 15 minutes. It was so simple and intuitive that seasonal proficiency training was not necessary. In addition, products could be issued, updated and cancelled with speed and precision. WWA has a graphical display, status board, and product expiration alarms that are great. But the human engineering of the system needs to be revamped. "

72. I find the application difficult and unintuitive to use...especially on followup or update statements. Many times I have had to update an advisory or warning which appears "unsent" in the WWA database, even though the previous shift had sent the product. WWA will not let you update that product since the program thinks it hasn't been sent and it is quite irritating to have to remake the product from scratch...especially if there is active weather going on. In addition...the procedure for selecting counties in the geo-viewer for segmented products is very unintuitive. Having to repeatedly save but not create text over and over again is a pain. A more XNOW-like approach where you select all of your segments right at the beginning, then you save once and a dialog box comes up to ask you what types of products you want in each segment would be a huge improvement."
73. Overall, it is a very useful application.
74. Our office attempted to use WWA last winter. As other offices gave up on it, we also dumped the use. It was very user unfriendly. The updates have not solved the basic serious problems with the software.
75. WWA has been more reliable the past few months...and it seems like everyone (or most everyone) is compatible so you can actually see there advisories, etc. But can't we get it all on one window?
76. WWA is NOT user friendly. It is a pain when you are dealing with winter events and multiple segmented products with different event durations. The cancel/clear process is confusing. Most of the time, in my experience, a complete cancelling on what is there (i.e. a multiple segmented winter event) solves the problem of trying to appropriately update a long fused watch, warning and advisory. Something needs to be done about making a new software extremely user friendly.
77. The main problem with WWA is lack of training and lack of staff. To be proficient, the software has to be used routinely. Issuing headlines is not a routine event. Training has been haphazard and that seems to me to be more of a Regional and Headquarters problem and not an office problem. The software is not very forgiving.
78. It's difficult to do follow-up through wwa for winter weather (advisories/watches/warnings).
79. WWA is STILL way too slow in launching. The inability to control zooming of the graphical interface is crippling in a state as large as Virginia, trying to see whether tiny independent cities have been selected or not. The WWA monitor often is too cluttered with far too much spurious information that does not help the forecaster. While overall the program is usable, it still has some distance before reaching the level of utility of a program like WARNGEN or XNOW.
80. WWA needs to be completely re-written from the ground up. It is nearly impossible for even the most competent and intuitive forecaster to use this software without stumbling into an error which cannot be corrected. For openers, the software is too stringent about what it considers to be an "issued" product. Small changes to the time in the UGC cause the product to not be issued correctly (thus the dreaded green banner in the Monitor). If the product is not issued correctly, then all the other functions of WWA (clear, cancel, follow-up) cannot be used properly. The software is woefully inadequate during complex active weather situations when Watches, Warnings, and Advisories need to be changed or upgraded. At a time when we need a software package to perform flawlessly to save us time during critical weather, WWA actually wastes more time by not functioning properly or not having the capability to easily change the orientation of advisories and warnings. I'm the WWA focal point and I still have difficulty during complex weather situations."
81. WWA is not very intuitive and it is not easy to use. When a watch or warning is issued and the next person does not use it to do updates, then there are problems in updating a product later. Also, if the steps are not followed exactly, then the product does not go out, does not go on CRS and/or stays on the homepage forever.

82. WWA is adequate and relatively easy to use for INITIAL issuances of a segmented product. For subsequent updates in which one may have to change expected onsets and expirations, add zones or re-configure existing groups the system is extremely cumbersome, overly complex and frustrating to use, with enhanced opportunities to make mistakes.
83. The overall buttonology of wwa was always perplexing for me as a forecaster, and is equally now as one of the persons who gets to support the software onsite. For example, I always found it difficult to determine how best to continue/cancel etc segmented wwa products. In supporting role we have tried to document best ways for our site to navigate the software, but it can be cumbersome. The overall flow of using this separate piece of software, outside of ifps/gfe also seems inconsistent, which is why a 'one for all' piece of software is not only desired but necessary. However, I do not see an advantage to lumping functions of RiverPro in with this. River forecasting seems like a separate entity, when looking at gridded data. From a maintenance and configuration perspective the templates are not a user friendly means for setup. For example, There is little or no inline documentation within these templates to assist in making changes.
84. It's a great tool for the rapid composing of long-term products, but the greatest advantage is the Geo Viewer. It gives a quick one-look overview of which office(s) have active or proposed products. We need to get every office using WWA for issuing their products so there is a consistent and complete view of what's issued.
85. There is only one aspect of WWA that I am dissatisfied with. Keeping track of multiple products in the same region, especially in the same zone, can be difficult at times given the current GUI.
86. Programs are not bad...but could be more flexible.
87. With each successive build over the past 2 years I have found WWA to be more user friendly and versatile when issuing severe weather warnings and statements as well as hydrological products.
88. WWA is a nightmare to use. There's waaaay too much clicking to do (in the proper order...which is hard to remember) in order to get a product out. I never use it for NOWcasts, even though it is mandated for that type of product issuance in ER. I use XNOW instead, as that software is infinitely more easy to use (with less clicking and a much better text editor). I am almost constantly asked by other staff members how they should be using WWA properly (even though I'm not the focal point), which is indicative to me that hardly anyone knows how to use it...even though we've been using it for years and years. I would humbly suggest that someone at MDL talk with the guy who developed XNOW in the field and either make WWA more useful or bag it entirely.
89. Winter weather products are the biggest pain, especially when changing watches to warnings, or warnings to advisories, etc. Segmentation is also a pain, especially in situations where you want to re-issue a product, but re-group the zones/counties for the new product.
90. THIS SOFTWARE IS JUST PLAIN TERRIBLE. HALF THE TIME IT DOESN'T PERFORM THE WAY IT WAS DESIGNED. SINCE COORDINATION/COLLABORATION IS PERFORMED THROUGH OTHER MEANS WHY IS WWA NEEDED. XNOW IS A MUCH BETTER AND EFFICIENT PIECE OF SOFTWARE FOR GETTING THE JOB DONE IN A TIMELY MANNER.
91. Very buggy. Poor follow-up capability. Poor ability to upgrade or alter areas already in effect. The idea was good but it should have never been mandated until it was ready for primetime. The forecasters and HMT's can not afford to waste time rewriting or redoing products. Too much time is wasted using this product. The best solution would be to nix the program until it has undergone more extensive testing with more field input.
92. WWA is the worst piece of software the NWS has ever developed. It is awkward, non-intuitive, and totally useless as monitoring software. It takes up the entire CRT screen and renders the screen useless for other

purposes, so naturally no one I know uses it to keep abreast of what other offices are doing.

93. In active weather (especially winter weather) using WWA to follow-up or change a active product has proved to impossible. Usually, the first step is to erase any existing product and start from the very beginning...increasing the work load.
94. THERE ARE SO MANY THINGS WRONG WITH WWA, I CANT LIST THEM ALL HERE. BUT I COULD WRITE AN E-MAIL IF YOU WANT. HERE IS A SHORT LIST: 1. UPDATES CURE 1 PROBLEM OR BREAK 6 OTHERS, 2. THINGS THAT WORKED BEFORE UPDATE DONT WORK NOW, 3. WWA CANNOT HANDLE WINTER WEATHER. IT THINKS ALL WEATHER ISSUANCES EITHER EXPIRE OR CONTINUE WITHOUT CHANGE. WHAT IF WEATHER MESSAGE IS UPGRADED FROM ADVISORY TO WARNING OR DOWNGRADED FROM WARNING TO ADVISORY?, 4. WWA CANNOT CREATE MESSAGE FOR CRS CONSISTENTLY. WE CANT REMEMBER HOW MANY BLANK LINES TO PUT BEFORE OR AFTER A HEADLINE, OR WHY HEADLINES ARE MANDATORY! WWA SHOULD HAVE MORE OPTIONS TO PERMIT EACH OFFICE TO DECIDE DURING OF CRS MESSAGE & OTHER THINGS.
95. It's very user unfriendly. This is especially the case when headlines are changing (i.e. have to cancel some counties, add others or upgrade/downgrade hazards).
96. The program is difficult to use. It does not handle events with multiple headlines well. If you do not do things in a very specific order, it will not work. The program does work when properly configured, but getting it to do so is often more time consuming than it should be.
97. The WWA software has been a miserable failure at the Cle office. From Day one we have had to make continuous adjustments on the fly to get out watches, warnings and statements. Adjusting counties within a product never works right so a whole new product is created each time in these situations and the old product then has to be canceled. The issued", "followup" and "clear" features are confusing and frequently don't work correctly."
98. The intended uses are fine, but there was never adequate training, and little documentation for configuration. It never worked properly, as far as injecting headlines.
99. The program is very non-intuitive and is not at all flexible. It takes too long to create a product, and often the product is not recognized as being transmitted. It's extremely difficult to downgrade warnings, upgrade watches or advisories, or add or delete areas to/from products. Follow up statements take too long because you always have to copy and paste text from previous versions or rewrite the whole thing. If you make an error creating the product (wrong expiration time, etc.) and you don't realize it until you're doing the text, it takes a long time to recreate the product. Overall, it's much easier for us to create a watch/warning/advisory product in our own locally developed editing software than it is to use WWA.
100. Important/critical information on WWA is disseminated by our office focal point and usually consists of local configuration information. This is what I find to be adequate for question 3. However, any new information, tips, or suggestions on this application from MDL would be helpful. I have no experience for questions 5 and 6 and left those questions blank.

101. If you make a mistake with times or counties in a WWA product (or if you want to change the time of the product), there is no easy way to fix it. The product has to be deleted off the list and remade which takes way too much time, especially during severe weather situations. Also, segmented products are awkward to make...ie. you have to make them in pieces, then create a product from the pieces. I wish there could be a way to make the product in one piece. Also I find the division of the product names cumbersome to go through when trying to find the name of the product I need to create on WWA. I'm much prefer to have all of the names on one drop down list in alphabetical order. I really like the idea of combining WWA/WARNING/RIVERPRO etc... I find myself having to think which software I have to open to issue which product. Example: during the January 1st 2003 flood event I had to have WWA open to issue the flood watch statement...WARNING open to issue the Flash Flood and Flood Warnings...and Riverpro open to issue the River Flood warnings and statements.
102. WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO EDIT THE UCG ON PRODUCTS AND STILL HAVE THEM XMIT PROPERLY PLUS SHOW UP IN WWA AS BEING TRANSMITTED.
103. There have been too many times when I have had to create a product expiration with a 5 minute duration, then not issued the text of it to make a watch/warning/advisory go away, then re-create the product. WWA is not forgiving if you mess up or need to make a change in the middle of product creation The interface is difficult. What is the difference between the clear", "cancel" and "delete"? Have a professional human factors consultant look the GUI over."
104. Major points in my mind: 1. Ya gotta reduce the countless number of mouse clicks required to get updates, followups, cancelations, upgrades constucted. Forecasters are taking sloppy shortcuts just to get products out in a timely fashion and once we move to VTEC - this practice will kill us as an agency. 2. We now issue our coastal flood watches/warnings from Riverpro becuase of the tremendous power behind the WHFS database structure. It doesn't speak to WWA and I refuse to have our staff go into WWA make all those clicks. Likewise for River Flood products too. There must be a way to make these two software programs speak with each other. 3. I must say I was spoiled with the ease in which XNOW allowed us to construct complex segmented products with ease. Now - I'm not nieve: I realize what WWA is trying to accomplish and it is an excellent piece of software. The ability to read the IFPS database and make initial calls on watches/warnings/advs is powerful by itself. Likewise, as with Warngen, to incorporate canned CTAs, etc. But operationally, it slows us down when we get to the more complex events.
105. 1) It is cumbersome. 2) Too many steps to create/cancel products. The steps you do have to go through do not make logical sense. In the heat of the battle, the software must run quickly and be easy to use. WWA is not easy to use. 3) The colors on the Geo viewer do not match those in the WWA Monitor(They should!). 4) We often have problems getting headlines into IFPS. Takes too long for products to clear from the monitor. Maybe it should not be connected to IFPS. 5)Still confusing for many people to have different product/hazard times. 6) It is very rare that the application runs as it should.
106. The software has been used sporadically at best at this office within the last year. Prior to this there was an effort to use it exclusively for watches/long fuse warning/advisories. However it was very difficult if not impossible to change/update products. We found that the initial issuance of a product was straight forward. But, when the product had to be changed in some way, say expiration time extended or areal coverage changed, the methodology to accomplish this was not intuitive. We were constantly going back to the instructions. There were numerous times that didn't even help. If we used wwa to update a product more often than not we ended up deleting the current product and started from scratch.

107. NWS offices may have situations where different warnings, watches, and advisories are in effect simultaneously for numerous counties. For some counties but not others, it appears to be difficult to cancel an ongoing event or change the headline category (watch to warning, advisory to warning) while an event is in progress. Issuing follow-up statements, especially when things change or counties need to be added, is difficult as well. In both of these instances, many feel it is better to start from scratch, however, this may have implications for the internet or NOAA Weather Radio. Having used XNOW in the past (> 2 years ago), that software package's design and method of operation appears better than WWA to issue hazardous weather products. Think about it another way: from one office the WWA instructions to compose different types of products in different ways resulted in 24 separate files on a floppy disk. Sure, the NWS issues many types of products. However, the issuances center around cancelling, warning, watching, advising, following-up, or just plain statementing". The person who prepared the instructions had to write a book to account for different ways WWA works in certain situations. Following-up, shifting counties between segments, cancelling counties while leaving other headlines up or changing headlines, should be easier."
108. WWA the theory is good, but why does it have to be so complicated to use. We have 2 pages of instructions and it seems 10 ways to issue the same product. Why not simplify the products.
109. The software is far too difficult to operate when headlines have to be changed. For instance, when part of an advisory area has to be upgraded to a warning and at the same time, another part of the advisory area has to be dropped altogether. These types of situations are very common in the Great Lakes region, especially when lake effect snowfall is concerned. The WWA software does not handle these situations well at all.
110. After several years, I still have about a .500 batting average in getting updated and changed segmented products correct the first try. Sometimes it is impossible to get the segments in the correct order when upgrading from a watch to a warning and canceling some counties. Too often a correction must be issued.
111. The WWA data flow is massively convoluted, and leads to frequent problems of unissued" products that are in fact issued. When folks ask me why something doesn't work, I just them show the data flow diagram...it's blatantly obvious. It is massively over engineered. This one-shot or else approach using flags is really a bad idea. If the product is written/received into the database, then the status window should state that it was issued. And it should not have to completely strip reformat products just to get on the NWR. Software should be written in a way that is more forgiving. The software is bloated and otherwise counter intuitive."
112. WWA in concept is a good idea, however it is cumbersome and not user friendly. It takes at least twice as long to generate a product from WWA than it did when we composed the product in XNOW. followup and cancellations also were much easier and less confusing.
113. It is not an intuitive, user-friendly piece of software. It is time consuming to issue a simple product (XNOW is much, much easier) and can be downright cumbersome with a complex product (i.e., multiple segments, expiring at different times).
114. WWA is very poor application's software...both operationally and administratively. Documentation...and training has been virtually useless. Find a way to get rid of WWA...and go with more of an XNOW type of GUI/administrative scheme (and/or incorporate it into GFE).

115. I have posted questions on the WWA infolist that go unanswered, there is no/little documentation on what the various parts of the templates mean, even when a straight forward question is asked (i.e. when is OB2), it takes weeks/months to get an answer. It has been very frustrating trying to set up WWA here in Honolulu, due to these and a lot of other factors. MDL calls here at 5 or 6 in the morning, when either I am just coming on shift, or going off shift (after a 12 hour night shift). This is also hours before our IT is in the office. The response time for our map was over a year, the response to zone 4 crashing the system was close to 6 months. While our most recent trouble ticket was closed out in a record 3 weeks, it should not have taken that long (once we found out what the problem was). We have not even begun to use this operationally, because we can't seem to finish setting it up. We're getting close, but I began this process more than a year ago, and seem to hit roadblocks all the time. It is also frustrating to me that MDL would like to change NWS policy (changing all products to segments, rather than allowing the insertion of \$\$ at the end of all products) rather than adjusting the software. Warnngen templates are much easier to deal with, and allow for local offices to adjust them for regional and local policy.
116. So many bugs, so little time. Operationally, it's like many other applications given to the field offices: won't really work right, so we either have to discover work arounds and let other offices know about them, or just use them as is and hope you can get products out on time and save people's lives and property.
117. The concept of WWA is good, the implemetation leaves something to be desired. Looking forward to the new self-contained WWA.
118. Below are three of the problems which I would identify as highest priority. 1) Changing the various headlines (ie. dropping counties or adding counties) is very difficult. 2) Improper headlines are selected by WWA. 3) When these headlines are hand edited they do not carry over to CRS.
119. With all due respect...this software is cumbersome...slow, and very restrictive in its use. Every use is a struggle, and most groan aloud when they use it. The idea behind it is wonderful...but its operational use has been quite a disappointment. For the most part...any changes or mistakes that need to be made to an existing product or map seem to always end up in failure. Maybe training is the key. Our focal point keeps us in the loop as much as possible...but the execution of the software leaves alot to be desired.
120. WWA needs more flexibility with its zone groups ala XNOW. For example, if I'm using WWA for a NOWcast and want to change my zone groupings at the last second, I can't. I would have to start over.
121. Too inflexible...cumbersome...not user friendly. See XNOW and WARNGEN. This should be the FIRST criteria that each application makes. The environment when using products like WWA by definition are multi variable with multiple decisions and diagnostics. This requires the user must be flexible...with a user friendly tool as the situation/environment changes...then add collaboration. This is why these 3 requirements are everything...most users consider 6-12 variations or more as they go through the decision making process. Again due to timing...multiple meteorological elements and sources...and nearby offices. Then add multisegmenting...editing and valid times on a fly
122. SEGMENTED PRODUCTS ARE CUMBERSOME. IT IS NOT EASY, OR NOT POSSIBLE, TO CLEAR PART OF A SEGMENT WHEN UPDATING. ISSUING THE PRODUCT INITIALLY (ANY PRODUCT) IS EASY, BUT UPDATING SEGMENTED PRODUCTS CAN BE VERY DIFFICULT.
123. Very difficult to use. Updating is a pain in the butt. Current instruction manual on site in some cases does not give you proper information on WWA. XNOW is a much better product. Ease of use, quick, no problems. Stick to XNOW and our troubles are OVER!!!

124. Operationally, WWA has generally well received by the office since we have started using it. A extensive training of the staff by myself and the SOO made transitioning to it less painful. It might be a good starting point for a comprehensive warning-watch-advisory-dissemination tool now under consideration. WWA's problems involve set up and maintenance. Need to get rid of data base portion and go to flat (ascii) type config files. While I can manipulate the templates in useful way the learning curve is steep and no one else in my office wants to take them on as a duty. Need to find a way to make the template editing easy for the uninitiated.
125. Very difficult to use. Segmented products not easily done and WWA is unforgiving when trying to do/update said products whereas XNOW is easy to make changes on the fly. DO NOT create one superapp!!!! If something goes wrong then the entire office must go into service backup. I know exactly what would be done in creating one superapp. You will just combine the code of each app into one instead of starting fresh from scratch.
126. Still not as flexible as Xnow. For instance, if in the middle of writing text for a nowcast of SPS, you cannot back out to add or delete counties to the product. The steps to go through for segmented products are too many/too complicated. The gui for setting the expiration times could be better- similar to the slider on XNOW.
127. WWA is hard to use on updates. It does not combine with GFE and IFPS products well. Especially when I have to issue multiple advisories or warnings for a large portion of my CWA.
128. Complex weather events are hard to put together and currently we are unable to practice various situations to gain experience other than real-time.
129. Like most of the crap you folks have developed over the last 10 years, this is simply another sorry example. In fact, do you know what is really the ultimate oxymoron---GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMER!
130. 1. WWA cannot handle winter weather operational scenarios. Here is an example: WFO issues a Winter Storm Warning for 15 counties in its CWA for today and tonight. The ProdExp is noon CST today, the Expires is 6 AM CST Tuesday. This original issuance is contained in one segment. At 10 AM, the forecaster decides to a) Continue the warning for 5 counties, b) downgrade the warning to an advisory for 5 counties, and c) cancel the warning for 5 counties. How can WWA do this and still create one coherent product (WSW) containing a cancellation segment, a warning segment, and an advisory segment? 2. There is no platform, such as the WES, on which to practice WWA. Lack of practice leads to lack of proficiency. In case the argument is made that one can save only "to practice WWA, consider this: clearing of WWA watches, warnings, and advisories cannot be done unless the product has actually been issued. Actually issuing the products, even with TEST included, lends to confusion among adjoining WFOs, and external users. Furthermore, issuing practice WWA products in an operational environment leads to fictional headlines appearing in the ZFPs generated by IFPS (via the WWAin program). 3. Last minute changes to watch, warning, and advisory areas cannot be accomplished in WWA. In reality, the forecaster has to start over. This is exceedingly frustrating during storm situations when time is of the essence. "Starting over" simply increases forecaster stress levels."
131. Interface can be somewhat difficult to use by different individuals, especially those that are not computer savvy."
132. HGX has opted not to use WWA because it is much easier for the forecasters to issue long-fused products using X-Now. (HGX would use WWA if it offered an improvement over X-Now in product generation.) At this time, there is no Southern Region requirement to use WWA so HGX will continue to use what works best for the forecasters. The WWA geo-viewer could be a nice tool for monitoring watches and warnings, except that it obtains it's expiration times from the time the text generation key is pressed, not when the product is officially issued.
133. MORE PLANNING AND TESTING FIRST AT MDL BEFORE SHIPPING TO FIELD OFFICES.

134. In my humble opinion, WWA needs to be entirely scrapped and started over again. The program, because of its excessive complexity, is riddled with bugs which require too many human resource hours to correct. The program does not allow much in the way of local customization, which means inland offices have whole lists of products in the WWA database that must be retained even though they'll never issue them. In addition, there are too many buttons and knobs" which make the program difficult to use without large scale editing of the text, or at the very least, extensive training on how to use. Finally, the documentation for WWA is out-of-date, poor, and can easily lead you down the wrong path. Warnngen, in contrast, despite its complexity, is much easier to modify for local needs, and there are several good documentation sources available from both MDL and field offices. We have recommended to our staff to use WWA with extreme caution, and that XNOW is still the preferred method to generate watches, warnings, advisories, and short-term forecasts. It is also my opinion that in its current state, WWA will make our conversion to VTEC even more difficult."
135. Need to fix counting scheme so that you don't have the problems of unissued products (which have indeed been issued) which follow-ups are not able to be created.
136. Speed of display is a problem, but that may be solved with the Linux workstation replacements. The GUI seems unintuitive. Test convective warnings shouldn't be seen unless we want them to be seen (should be some sort of option). The long list of advisories/watches/warnings in the list makes it difficult to find the important ones, even though we can toggle off other office's watches/warnings. Training will be much easier once it can be used on the WES. Regarding number 7. It is absolutely of the utmost importance that if we are going to have one product for issuing WWA, Warnngen, Flood type products, that it be: 1. FAST 2. Customizable 3. NOT have a long list of product types to scroll through to issue the product. ANYTHING that slows down the convective warning process because of a complicated GUI or a long listing of choices, is BAD.
137. Everything about WWA makes it harder to configure and use than any of the applications it was meant to replace. Additionally, its use greatly enhances the potential for error (too many hoops), and there has NEVER been an A to Z set of instructions for configuring WWA. That is one of the reasons its use is not yet mandated in SR.
138. WWA works well enough for me (and I am our office WWA focal point) if I am simply creating a new product. However, if I am doing a follow-up product, and choose to make significant changes such as counties, valid times, and/or type of product, then WWA is a very user unfriendly piece of software! In these cases, one is better off to cancel any current WWA issued products, then create the new ones from scratch. Also...You should be able to create a proposed product and simply save it without actually sending the product. This is usually the case as you are working on the ZFP product, but need to start a proposed associated Watch/Advisory/Warning ahead of time.
139. Would like to see integrated application with easier method of product creation and administration.
140. While I am very anxious to get WWA started, we still do not have our entire geographic location covered. Thus, WWA is still largely unusable by our office. Many improvements have been made over the past year, but we still have a long ways to go in order for it to become a completely usable application.
141. I see the potential, and I must admit that most of the problems at our office may be self imposed. As AWIPS focal point I have recieved no formal training and thus have done most of my work through trial and error as well as contacting nearby WFO's. If I was sent to a residence training course I am sure I would gain much more confidence. The website is always a nice starting point but seems to lack all of the details and often doesnt have the exact answers I am looking for.
142. make it simpler.

143. POSSIBLY THE LEAST USER FRIENDLY SOFTWARE I HAVE EVER SEEN. IT SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED WITH NO THOUGHT FOR THE FIELD. IT IS BY FAR THE BIGGEST TRAINING PROBLEM, AND IT WASTES AN INCREDIBLE AMOUNT OF FORECASTERS TIME. I AM THE WWA FOCAL POINT, AND I HAVE TO SELL THIS PIECE OF #&*% TO THE STAFF. WITH THE TECHNOLOGY THAT IS OUT THERE, HOW IS IT POSSIBLE THE WEATHER SERVICE GOT STUCK WITH THIS?
144. WWA should allow the user to correct mistakes easily. That is not possible today.
145. Out of all the newer" software to come out, this has been the hardest one to sell to the staff, get the staff or surrounding offices to use, or to use myself. There must be a reason for this. I don't think the interface/GUI is designed in a user friendly way. The process to update, delete, etc. doesn't seem logical (at least to me). Programs like GFE or XNOW seem so much more simpler and have a far lower learning curve."
146. The WWA software did not appear ready" when it was released to the field. The software seems overly complex and problems are difficult to resolve. Support and repair of problems is often slow."
147. Would be nice to have an integrated editor. Also the ability to edit the previous product when doing a follow up statement. For the most part WWA works very well for issuing severe thunderstorm and tornado watches.
148. Below are our comments supplied to NWS SRH CWWD regarding a recent WWA survey. ----- 1. Is your office using WWA, and/or is XNOW still the main software you use for issuing products? The consensus from our forecasters at MAF is that XNow is used for a majority of our products most of the time. I had WWA configured to the point I felt confident forecasters could produce NPWs and WSWs, however, we encountered a serious problem after our AWIPS 5.2.2 installation. Apparently some of our templates do not match with selected items in WWA. For instance, one of our forecasters attempted to create a HWO and instead got a LBBAFPMAF PIL instead. 2. Do you have suggestions on improvement for the WWA software? Melinda, it is the opinion of us at MAF that WWA is not acceptable for operational use. Among the significant issues: 1) We cannot easily reconfigure zone/county groupings for a particular product (e.g., we have a winter storm warning and a winter weather advisory in effect at the same time and we want to move" a few counties from the advisory to the warning). 2) We cannot easily upgrade or downgrade NPWs or WSWs (e.g., upgrade a high wind watch to a high wind warning). 3) We cannot queue products for future transmission. 4) We've had great difficulty issuing follow-up products. The consensus is that we prefer to retain the text from the previous product in subsequent follow-up products. 5) Warnngen has a audible/visible alert that notifies the forecaster when a particular warning is about to expire. A similar alert is desired for WWA-based products. 6) There is no color differentiation in differing WWA's in the GeoViewer. This lack of color differentiation makes WWA unusable for issuing nowcasts. 7) WWA configuration is problematic at best. For instance, the recent decision regarding placing double-dollar delimiters at the bottom of all non-segmented products will require each focal point at each office to manually go through each template, add the new string, and then relocalize each AWIPS workstation and server. We received a NWSI directive last summer regarding the HWO, but no corresponding template was delivered by MDL. The field produced a suitable template, and now the format for the HWO has changed again! Simply put, changes contained in various directives are moving much faster than the development cycle of the WWA application, requiring duplication of efforts across the entire NWS. I estimate that I've spent about 100 man-hours on WWA over the past one and a half years. Suitable documentation simply does not exist, product requirements change almost weekly, and the application itself does not appear to be stable across software upgrades. Frankly, we believe we are at the point of diminishing returns regarding WWA configuration. The WWA GUI is not user-friendly, there does not exist upgrade/downgrade or reconfiguration options, and forecasters cannot queue up products for future transmission. Significant investments of time will be needed to ensure that WWA-issued products are in compliance with NWS directives, and we believe the time spent on WWA issues would be better spent on other AWIPS, IFPS, and GFE issues. In comparison, XNow is easy to use and the forecasters are already familiar with this application. We can reconfigure and upgrade or downgrade products with relative ease, and it is easy to navigate around the user GUI. It is the consensus of the staff at MAF that until the above issues are addressed and WWA becomes a mature application, we will use XNow for all long-fused watch, warning, and advisory products."

149. How about marine functionality as promised? XNOW has had this feature for many years. The field needs one program that generate all statements, watches, warnings and advisories. Let's merge WarnGen and WWA and some type of similar GUI like XNOW. Since I am the focal point for both, how about making it easy to customize these programs. These templates that Jim Ramer came up with can be rather clunky at times.
150. It is behind where today's technology should allow us to be. Also have concerns it has no future in an NDFD gridded forecast era. Seems that WWA should be incorporated into GFE/IFPS, not the other way around. Also concerned about trying to pack WWA, WarnGen, XNOW into one big application...we've had numerous bugs with each of these, I cannot imagine the problems we'll deal with in an attempt to put all into one program.
151. It is not user friendly. Our forecasters complain that about 75 percent of the time they must completely start over when updating, downgrading, upgrading, etc. a product with WWA. Text is completely wiped out when re-issuing any type of product. It would be very nice for the program to be robust enough to recognize at least minor changes made to the UGC line after a product is created. I do like being able to view products from our and other offices on the map.
152. Although there are too many dissemination tools now, I believe merging ALL of them would create a tool even more cumbersome than WWA.
153. Most user unfriendly piece of software we use. No easy, fast, efficient way to put out products, especially upgrades and downgrades to products. Why can't there just be the WWA Map if coordination is the main goal of the program. We can still issue products then in XNOW and the map can display the info, that would make more sense than what we have to do now.
154. WWA does not allow for easy addition or deletion of counties to existing watches warnings or advisories.
155. In general this is a useful program, however the interface to get products into CRS from WWA needs to be improved. It is not easy to set up, and I have had trouble finding documentation.
156. It is cumbersome to use and I never have trusted its stability. It is not easy to make changes to WWA and too much of the code is black boxed. The NWS should start from scratch and have a new warning/watch/advisory program. The main features should be ease of use and the ability for the local WFO to easily adapt the software for their own needs.
157. The scripting language used to design templates is undocumented and poor. I think that a more standard scripting language - shell script, tcl, Perl, etc. should be implemented to make template construction and maintenance easier. The interface is a little clumsy - too many pop up GUIs. It would be nice if the geography selection did not conform to geopolitical boundaries.
158. Referring to #7...I wish the menu for HAZARDS were open when WWA opens instead of having to look through pull down menus to get the title.
159. I believe WWA gets a worse rap than it deserves. There are some things that could be better (but that is the case with any software package!) I believe that when the improvements planned are implemented, it will be a pretty robust application.
160. The application overall is adequate, but it does not readily provide flexibility in adjusting warned counties. The clear feature does exist, but it is confusing to use. I've yet to do it successfully first time through. Plus, if you wish to cancel part of a group, and continue an advisory/warning for the remainder of the group, policy dictates that each part receives an appropriate WWA. Either the software cannot do this, or I've yet to figure out how. This is the only complaint I have. If you're issuing a product, following up on a product, or cancelling a product in its entirety, with software works just fine.

161. It is a very poor piece of software and is clumsy (sp) to use (XNOW was simpler).
162. I came from an office where WWA was not used. The application has some very nice features such as the ability to see what other offices have issued. However, like all NWS software, it was dumped on the field with inadequate documentation. Please realize that any software designed for operations must be 99% fullproof, easily configurable, well documented, and brought to the field with extensive training. Field personnel currently deal with GFE/IFPS/AWIPS/ORPG/CRS/WWA/XNOW/LSR/AVNFPS for operational systems. Programmers focus on one or two. Enlisting the support of SOOs, focal points, COMET, or some other group with training expertise would bridge the gap and greatly increase the effectiveness of the software.
163. As a warning product I find this application to be cumbersome and unforgiven. It is not intuitive, has poor GUI interface and no practise mode.
164. not always the most intuitive and making any changes at all requires one to start over.
165. Cumbersome. Not user friendly. Should be shortened and standardized. Tailored to local offices. When I say tailored to individual offices, I'm talking about the interface, product selection, etc. However, all product templates should be functional and standardized across the board. Product templates should not have to be tweaked. Support from a Regional level and MDL have been poor at best. Continue to have problems left unattended to due to a lack of response/communication from those that could help us.
166. Would suggest that efforts begin immediately to convert the WWA function into a GFE platform. GFE functionality is superior and Smart Tools" could be developed locally to ensure consistency."
167. Are you kidding me? This is the most difficult, time consuming, horrible software I have ever worked with. I am sorry to be so honest but I think I speak for a large majority of field people. I have worked with WWA for 3 years now, and still need our local cheat sheet" to issue a segmented product. I consider myself computer literate and able to learn new software quickly. This software, however, is too cumbersome and complicated for fast dissemination. Great idea but poor execution. I just had an event this week where I was informed that WWA could not properly code the WSW I was issuing. COULD NOT PROPERLY FORMAT IT?? This software has been out for 3 years and it cannot properly format a WSW???(It would not put a cancellation first before a warning). I had to send out a product improperly formatted because I had to use WWA! Explain that to the local media who have their own software that needs a properly coded format! Sorry for raving but this is 3 years of frustration! "
168. The program just seems to be too long. What should be a 3 or 4 step process ends up being 7 or 8. Though I do like the concept of WWA.
169. Programatically, it seems to consider the forecaster last. Forecasters DO NOT want to have to fiddle around with software, they have enough weather issues to deal with. This software should do most of the work for you and it currently does not. It is 2003, and the software cannot even retain the text from the previously issued product. There are still product diffencies that occur with following up convective watches at offices without the convective watch dissemination responsibility. NWR server remains unstable and is not trusted. I also don't understand why Perl is used only for the generation of convective warning products for NWR and not the remainder of the NWR products that are generated. The NWR product generation should be removed from ALL programs that are utilized in this system and be made a seperate entity. The NWR program should be a catch all program (written in Perl) that creates an NWR message from the ACTUAL PRODUCT ISSUED (e.g. CAFE). I have spent numerous hours training the staff how to use this software and some are still not clear. It is time to take a new direction. I have an idea. WHY NOT DRAW YOUR HEALINES IN GFE? This would be saved in a database as a shapefile or some other lat lon database file. It could then be used to create text headlines and products from (since time boundaries would also be included), hence all the information would be there that you need. The image could then be disseminated to the web as needed. Finally, using an info list to disseminate changes or fixes is very very very poor business. I do not subscribe to many of these any more because they are so verbose. I would get 500 emails/wk between these and my interoffice email. That's

asanine.

170. Make the interface on WWA more like the XNOW program, which is much more user friendly and saves steps when a segmented product is generated. Highlighted items are sometimes difficult to distinguish. Local office needs discretion to remove hazards that are not applicable to their forecast area, and ensure that all hazards conform to the new NWS directive. No more than two cascading menus, please! Allow current time to be stamped in the headers when product is sent, not time the product was started in WWA. If segments contain combination of warnings, watches, and advisories, hold the expiration time in place for all segments unless forecaster chooses to change them. Allow the forecaster to exclude city list if desired. Program has improved since earlier builds, but more work needs to be done to be fully suitable for operational use.
171. For simple, non-segmented products it is easy to use. When it comes to segmented products involving multiple types of advisories, etc or upgrading/downgrading headlines, it becomes very cumbersome and can sometimes take as much time as to work with the IFPS grids.
172. Generating segmented products...which many of our long fused products are of this type...are not user friendly to generate. Make it more like XNOW where each segment is painted a different color (or assign a number for each segmented zone if colors won't work) before the product is generated/saved.
173. The software has numerous shortcomings. Our Regional Headquarters asked us to provide input for a list they were compiling, which I am assuming has been forwarded to the appropriate developers.
174. Initial issuance of a warning/advisory/watch via WWA is okay. However, updates are very cumbersome. Especially if you have to add/delete segments, different times for the segments, etc. Also, during an update you lose the text from the original product. You're forced to cut and paste using the AWIPS editor.
175. I find WWA very difficult to manipulate. While it is easy to issue the initial product, the ability to make changes to a product about to be issued or to adjust areas is very cumbersome. I worked with Rich Naiastat (MPX) for two weeks to develop job sheets for forecasters to help make it easier to manipulate headlines. This is because no training was given to SOOs on WWA and we needed to learn it on our own. Some of the manipulations resulted in a 30 step procedure for forecasters. The result is that most forecasters will just start over if they need to change headlines from the current configuration.
176. Needs to have an easy way to train, since some features are not used but once or twice a year. We should be able to practice with a followup, cancel, or other product without having to officially issue a Watch first. Also would be nice to see a preview of the headline" it is going to inject into zones first, so modifications can be made, if necessary."

177. I think I speak for most of Alaska Region in saying, we feel very strongly that all dissemination tools be merged into one awesome, new application! Please try to accomplish that in the future. As for WWA, we have configured it locally and want to start using it, but there still seems to be some outstanding issues. From my perspective, I have had to spend numerous days getting decent call-to-action statements into each of our WWA products. Our ITO Angel Corona will be at the upcoming WWA meeting back there and should be able to technically explain things much better than I ever could.
178. This is one of the worst programs we use at this office. It is very cumbersome compared to using XNOW or other products. The only advantages I can see using WWA are, the coordination option and surrounding offices seeing what headlines we have out. During most headline events, we call our surrounding offices anyway. Future updates to this program should include at a minimum, 1) the capability to keep the text of the previous product in the updated version, 2) an easier way to clear and cancel parts of headlined products, 3)an easier method to enter expiration times of the product.
179. When WWA was loaded here at North Platte a message was posted that it was the official means of dissemination in less than a two week period from its load. Once loaded the software was used by several during a active winter period without ANY training provided. I learned to dislike the program from the start. Training and documentation on WWA was only provided after I went to the MIC. Since then I have learned to use it mainly on my own (OJT). The SOO provided members an overview of WWA after the complaint was made.
180. We have used it as a primary dissemination tool for over 2 years now and have found ways to work around many of the problem areas, however the program is simply not as versatile as some of its predecessors (like SRWARN) during various stages of product selection, drafting, editing, and updating...especially given the resources allocated to it. There is no practice mode and this is a major impediment to the staff training and implementation of this package. Several of the cross-coordination and update functions are just beginning to work properly...at build XXX. It has also been an sysadmin top-heavy program requiring way too many manhours to keep upgraded.
181. TOO complicated, too difficult to correct mistakes. This is the essence of fulfilling our mission- this software should be simple, foolproof, and easy to correct any operator error. The monitor listing who has what products is redundant and trivially unimportant. I assume that WWA is convoluted partly to produce this display. Producing the display should be completely divorced from producing timely warnings.
182. It is very cumbersome to use, especially for segmented products. I don't see any easy solution to this problem, except going back to a free text editor!
183. I like how the cities come up in the warnings once the city files are correct in AWIPS. I like having the choice of calls to action so you aren't reaching for the possibilities in the middle of a warning situation. I don't like how you can't save a practice warning in a practice file for drills. I only used WWA in LKN where I recently moved from.
184. Cumbersome and not user friendly with mesoscale weather.
185. too difficult to change areas (without starting over). Any change to areas requires starting all over. I Never look at the WWA info list.

186. The clear function does not work. It never worked well, but it now is worse. We need better ability to convert a segment of a WWA to something else (upgrade/downgrade/cancel, to recombine zone segments, to divide up a previous grouped set of zones and do different things to different zones, to be able to make products that have both public and marine zones in them (and properly construct the UGC code line), have easier access to start a WWA admin program, have a list of fire weather zones when they don't match and are not entirely contained with the CWA. Even as the focal point, information on fixes and improvements in WWA come in fits and starts. Less information has been coming on the WWA list server. At times messages appear that MDL does not answer when I think it would be helpful. Problems with new builds should get better dissemination on the list server.
187. Our WWA doesn't format and produce a worded text message for the Hazardous Weather Outlook (CAEHWOCAE). It should produce this file under WRKWG# or WRKHWO. We use a local application which works just as well or better than WWA for the HWO. However, WWA produces other watch, warnings, advisories, and statements just fine.
188. WWA takes too long to start up. WARNGEN starts up much faster. When I make a mistake in formatting expiration time, I do not like having to go back into the program, fixing the error, and regenerating the product.
189. Like the coordination capabilities and the ability to put products together in a standardized format. Has the potential to be a very good tool, but needs to be more user friendly. Sometimes it is easier to just clear all the warnings that are in effect on wwa and start over.
190. I still cannot get WWA to do all the things I need it to do. It happens often that some" zones need to be dropped from a warning while at the same time others need to be downgraded to an advisory, and at the same time other zones need to continue under a warning. I do not know how to do this with WWA, and to my knowledge, neither does anyone else in my office."
191. Poorly conceived program, perhaps one of the worst I've used in my 16 years in the NWS. Not user-friendly or intuitive--I have to relearn it every time I use it. Merging WWA with WarnGen and other dissemination programs is a mistake, for several reasons. First and foremost, debugging such an all-encompassing program would become night-marish. Local customization would be more difficult than it already is. Finally, there is a fundamental difference in the thought-process in dealing with long- and short-term meteorology and product generation--it's apples and oranges.
192. WWA came into this world not ready for prime time and has never been up to the job. It is inadequate for most anything it is suppose to do. It causes more forecaster problems than the weather. It is another example of bottom-down management of the NWS.
193. Where do you begin. No practice mode for one. How are you supposed to learn how to use something that critical without practice. Very confusing interface. Monitor window plus a map in a different window? Microsoft wouldn't even do that. Those 2 need to be combined into one. Very unforgiving and quirky. Just yesterday, I deleted a blank line that did not need to be there. The program deleted the line, but then wordwrapped the UGC code, moving some code to the line above. The coding was still correct, but apparently because the code was changed" in WWA's eyes, when the product was sent, WWA did not recognize it as being sent. That's crazy! I could go on but have work to do. Just scrap the entire thing and start over. Talk to the XNOW programmer. He has a program that works."
194. Very slow to load and react to functions. I often have to try a few differnt times to get the product to have the correct expiration time. My main complaint is that it is just very slow and boggs down the machine.
195. WWA is slow and it is not user friendly. It needs to have map color coding for counties available for multiple segmented products, similar to the XNOW program. I also needs to be able to retain the previous wording of routine products and not begin with a clean slate". Or better yet, it could ask you if you want to retain the

previous wording."

196. Could be a better way to outline affected areas. Zones vs. counties is always confusing, though this is more a matter of NWS policy. Let's have all hazardous weather products (all warnings, watches, advisories and statements, even outlooks) county based, which will eliminate confusion and make things much easier for the programmers.
197. This software was poor and there never was an upgrade/bug fix which helped. This software needed to have a storyboard design team to make the interface user friendly. In short there are 9 different ways to issue a product in WWA, in the WFO there should be only 2 or 3, otherwise proficiency is a real issue. Why is it important to have a user friendly design, 9 forecasters rotate through 7 shifts through the year, considering AL, and the weather, a forecaster may only issue a product using WWA every x number of weeks. It is embarrassing how much effort MDL, HQ, the Regions, and field wasted on this software back in 99, it was clear from forecaster response and proficiency this software was DOA, it was just a matter of time before it was heard. There is much to learn from this, if the field does not embrace the software after X number of builds then that software needs to be replaced. Now we are far enough down the road that WWA really isn't needed. WWA provides a product template, this can be done with IFPS formatters, eliminating proficiency issues. WarnGen, River Pro and XNOW are mature software packages that work well, have few bugs and are superior to WWA style applications. Frankly with 5 FTEs on WWA, I expect a great deal. WWA is a poor application if 1 FTE has wasted his time on it, it's a shame if we are wasting 5 FTEs on it. I don't mean to hurt their feelings but XNOW and PANDA and PCLSR were all written by 1 person working shifts and they were far better applications. I hope NBC news doesn't hear about this waste of taxpayer money.
198. This software was poor and there never was an upgrade/bug fix which helped. This software needed to have a storyboard design team to make the interface user friendly. In short there are 9 different ways to issue a product in WWA, in the WFO there should be only 2 or 3, otherwise proficiency is a real issue. Why is it important to have a user friendly design, 9 forecasters rotate through 7 shifts through the year, considering AL, and the weather, a forecaster may only issue a product using WWA every x number of weeks. It is embarrassing how much effort MDL, HQ, the Regions, and field wasted on this software back in 99, it was clear from forecaster response and proficiency this software was DOA, it was just a matter of time before it was heard. There is much to learn from this, if the field does not embrace the software after X number of builds then that software needs to be replaced. Now we are far enough down the road that WWA really isn't needed. WWA provides a product template, this can be done with IFPS formatters, eliminating proficiency issues. WarnGen, River Pro and XNOW are mature software packages that work well, have few bugs and are superior to WWA style applications. Frankly with 5 FTEs on WWA, I expect a great deal. WWA is a poor application if 1 FTE has wasted his time on it, it's a shame if we are wasting 5 FTEs on it. I don't mean to hurt their feelings but XNOW and PANDA and PCLSR were all written by 1 person working shifts and they were far better applications. I hope NBC news doesn't hear about this waste of taxpayer money.
199. WWA is a program in search of a use. It performs 3 simple functions in an unnecessarily complex way. First - it produces generic coding for headings. I have no argument with its performance and ease of use here. Second - it lets other weather offices know where the watch...advisories and warnings are. This is where things get too complex. A couple of short simple phone calls to other offices obviate the need of this overly complex function. Or...one computer in headquarters could scan all current watch and warning products every 5 minutes and generate an updated national map...it would be really quite simple. Third - it writes headlines. I can write headlines for 10 zones groups in less than 2 minutes...why do I need a computer program to do it...especially when I have to edit them anyway.
200. Support staff has been very helpful. We are waiting to see how WWA works with the IFPS grids before making any judgements.

201. The expiration time adjusters could be more intuitive. Otherwise, the program is reasonably usable.
202. The steps required to clear/cancel/follow up segmented/non-segmented products remain confusing to many forecasters.
203. This software was not user friendly when we began using it a couple years ago. In fact, it made doing simple things such as updating advisories or warnings a nightmare. Please give the National Weather Service operational forecast staff a software that is usable and not useless!
204. WWA is very user unfriendly.
205. There seems to be a lot of good information out there on WWA configuration and use but many people don't know about it. A well publicized website with all things WWA would be great. I don't want to see WWA get any bigger than it is. Keep WarnGen separate. When severe weather is occurring, we need fast small apps to generate warnings, not big slow ones. Make WWA long fuse and leave WarnGen for short fuse products. WarnGen is bordering on too big for its purpose too. Could be much more integrated into D2D and more compact.
206. WWA is not very user-friendly. Tasks which should be simple (e.g. bailing out of a WWA in progress and starting over) are not. Not having unique colors for each segment is bad. Being able to see adjacent offices WWAs is good.
207. This had to be THE worst of the new software packages released in the last several years by MDL. The functionality was totally confusing between clearing, cancelling, deleting, proposing, follow up, etc. The focal point had to repeatedly train the staff here on the use of the software, and even with complete, detailed instructions (above and beyond the user's manual), forecasters still have difficulty managing the products, even after several years of use. The software is so poor with regard to changing hazard areas, and timing of the hazards, we essentially do not use WWA as it was intended to be used, and merely use it to create and disseminate products by setting all expiration times to that of when the products expire. We use it basically because we have to. Please use X-NOW as a model for future interface development, as it is a very useful piece of software for getting our job done, and done efficiently!
208. can not upgrade a watch to a warning, nor clear part of a warning while extending the product expiration time.
209. A combination of XNOW and WWA is needed. There needs to be a way of saving the previous wording and to update the header for an updated time of dissemination. WWA is not conducive for typing up a product for later dissemination. This is also shocking given the amount of time it takes to write a product from scratch. Even if you disseminate immediately there can be 20 to 30 minutes between the time you bring the window up to issuance time which means that lag will reflect on the time line.

210. This winter season, we exercised our regional option to implement a local policy not to use WWA for operations. The reason is simple. There were a great number of inefficiencies, workarounds, and future fixes/upgrades, and continually developing problems or shortcomings, and we already had a reliable system in place for doing everything WWA was trying to do. I find it absurd that the NWS forced this application in the laps of the field offices in the state it was in. A better way to have implemented the application would have been to select a handful of field offices to use the application for a time as test beds. Then test, develop, and fix the software. When most of the kinks are ironed out, then push the application out. During the implementation of IFPS and with all the other rapid change ongoing in the NWS, why complicate the system with premature implementation of untested and unneeded software? Moreover, this is an application which develops the front-line products which are crucial of the NWS mission of saving lives and property. Next, forcing the forecaster to use a mix of applications for developing products is a pain. Why develop a SVR with WarnGen, and then follow it up in WWA? Confusion stemmed from which products should be issued with which application. There was no standardization. The proposed WWA thing was surprising to me too. At the time WWA came around the NWS had a fairly well-defined system of watch, warning, advisory in place with OMLs and ROMLs defining how we do business. Suddenly the Proposed WWA came along without any policy or guidance on how it was to be used.
211. Needs to be more user friendly. Should work similar to XNOW in its functionality.
212. there needs to be a specific option to cancel a watch/warning/advisory as a segment, since we must issue a segment in the product to talk about cancellation. of course, in an ideal world, all of these text products would go away and be absorbed by a graphical forecast database.
213. Would be nice to read the advisories from other offices by clicking on them.
214. WWA has never incorporated the XNOW features of changing things on the fly. WWA is very user unfriendly. It works backwards from how the forecasters have been operating for many years. Eastern Region Headquarters, send in a request of 34 changes that were needed in WWA about 3 years ago. Only a fraction of those changes were ever made.
215. I'll mirror comments made by others from this office. It's hard to use, inflexible, and not designed well. We need to be able to change zone splits on the fly and cancel/change products without having to go through a convoluted process. XNow is a great program. It's everything WWA is not. Please adapt WWA to be a XNow-type interface. We need to be able to hit the delete" key and have the product we don't want disappear. Right now that doesn't happen. If you cancel a product, then hit "delete" to get it out of the database, it reappears! With XNow already out there, THERE WAS NO REASON TO EVER START FROM SCRATCH WITH A NEW PROGRAM!!! Please listen to people out here in the field and if there is software we like, please just use that software as a starting point instead of trying to re-invent the wheel (which doesn't work very often and is a waste of time). In short, software is supposed to make our jobs easier, not harder."
216. It needs to be affiliated with GFE so you can get everything done in one program, rather than using two separate programs.
217. Works fine for initial issuance...however, anything after that is a problem. Especially, if areas are upgraded to warning from advisory...or vice versa.
218. I don't understand why the clear feature does not work whenever I need/try to use it. I think the GUI is ok, but the operations that deal with an existing product/WWA are difficult to use, if they work at all. If all portions of the application worked as I understood them to work, it would be fine.

219. WWA can be cumbersome and confusing to use especially when updating products or trying to correct errors or change zone groupings. The update window has too many products to scroll through during active weather that it is difficult to find the correct groupings to place together. Do not like the way the product expiration times and length of the watch/warning is set through the GUI, the times are linked, and the proper wording in the product headlines is incorrect. Cancelling and followup are not easy to use especially when only certain zones are going to be cancelled and then followed up. The window overlapping also makes the application a bit more user unfriendly.
220. The WWA display has not been updating products from surrounding offices as it has in the past. It is difficult to use when changing the group of an advisory or warning (adding/deleting counties). Basically to get a decent display, you have to delete what you have going and start from scratch. The display list is too crowded when the products have been changed but not the previous ones were not deleted.
221. WWA could be more 'user friendly' in terms of creating follow up statements to previously issued products. Also there are too many 'mouse clicks' needed to create the products you want. Basically, WWA is a good tool, but the human factors aspect of it is weak.
222. Too many mouse clicks. Not enough keyboard control. Fonts too small.
223. At times hard and cumbersome to make follow up statements or make areal or temporal changes to existing headlines.
224. right now, it doesn't open on a Text workstation...that's too bad. It also takes forever to start. And not sure I like having to choose Lx1 or Lx2, as the alert that comes up afterwards is confusing..another user already on" or something like that. How much slower will that system be due to multiple users? Convective season will let us know that one..."
225. WWA is still very cumbersome to use, and is not very intuitive at all when it comes to cancelling portions of a watch and/or adding other counties to an existing advisory or watch.
226. If this were commercial software, not one copy would have been sold. The interface is not intuitive. It is not smoothly integrated with other AWIPS text software. It just plain clunky and screwy to use. Training on station has been non-existent.
227. WWA WORKS, BUT THERE IS A LOT OF ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT. IF ALL YOU NEED TO DO IS ISSUE A ROUTINE PRODUCT ONCE A DAY, WWA WORKS FINE. HOWEVER IN SITUATIONS WHERE THINGS CHANGE RELATIVELY QUICKLY WWA BECOMES CUMBERSOME, ESPECIALLY WHEN CHANGING TO AND FROM A WATCH, ADVISORY OR WARNING.
228. It is very difficult to update segments with WWA, especially when one part of a segment is cleared or cancelled while other portions remain in effect, especially when compared to the initial issuance.
229. Most, if not all of the time, WWA will not pick up the SEV issued by SPC. It will show up in the monitor window, but you have to exit the software and restart it for the map to be displayed. Output expiration/purge times are different than what you enter in the GUI.
230. prefer to have WWA features included in IFPS (GFE) as a headline grid". This would allow for quicker collaboration among offices and smart tools for consistency. "

231. This comment came to me in email this morning and I thought I would pass it along to you. (again this is a real email only the names have been changed) BOB" Well...WWA strikes again. The situation : It's 3:30 am, xxxday morning. The ongoing advisory for xxxx and much of xxxxx counties is about to expire. "JEFF" decided to extend the advisory for County A, County B, County C and County D...and let the rest of the counties expire. So I looked at the directions for both clearing a portion of the advisory and for extending the valid time of the portion of the advisory. I first cleared the counties for which I wanted the advisory to expire...and then went back in to try to extend the advisory for County A county for today and tonight, and County B, County C and County D for just today. Well...WWA would not let me click on County A only to extend the expiration time for 5 am xxxday morning. So I was left with no way to split County A out from the rest of the remaining counties for a differing expiration time. At this point...the only thing I could do was to cancel everything and start over...so I did. Next, I generated new advisories for County A (today and tonight) first, and then for County B, County C and County D (today). In WWA Monitor, I selected the cancelled advisory first, then the two new advisories I just designated. When the text was created...I got nothing for the cancelled advisory and only got info for the two new advisories. Sooooo...after a mini internal rage session...I issued the new advisories and then manually generated my own cancellation statement for the expired advisory. Just wanted to keep you informed of WWA's performance, or should I say nonperformance (if Bill Gates wrote stuff like this...he'd be living in a tent right now). However...it's certainly possible that I did something wrong (maybe I should try spinning around 3 times on one leg while holding a rabbit's foot before I embark on another WWA adventure). If anyone has any ideas as to how I should have attempted the above scenario...please let me know. I'll take all the advice I can get when it comes to this thing! NAME...end of email text This is an example of the frustration that our staff has with your software. (This is also where I am frustrated with your software, what is my response to this person? Were you able to read this through and quickly write a response that tells her what she should have done?) I don't believe that it is lack of trying I believe it is poor software. I hear these comments daily, it is rare that someone puts it in and email. The staff is just asking for software that they understand, not even software that is perfect. The only fix I can think of is a different application, most likely with a different team of programmers. I would love to give my name so that we could discuss this particular case but I fear that my comments would be seen as negative and I don't wish to become involved in that. Cases as described above are common enough that you should be able to locate an office with similar problems and provide guidance to the field on how to do this. "
232. The instructions we have for WWA are very hard to use and confusing. If you make a mistake when doing a follow up product, WWA will not allow you to issue a follow-up again for that product...very user unfriendly.
233. Forecasters, too often, cannot figure out how to use it in time-critical situations. They don't know when to use "Follow-up" vs. "New". They don't understand the difference between "Clear" and "Cancel". There is a Winter Weather Advisory in effect. You want to keep the Advisory for some Zones, kill it for other Zones, and upgrade part of it to a Warning. No forecaster can figure out how to do this without wasting a lot of time experimenting (and in this type situation, there is no time at all for experimenting). What order do you go in to do the above? There is nothing to guide you. (A nearby office ran into a similar situation recently and told me they ended up using XNOW to compose their message because they couldn't figure out how to do it with WWA.) The program should have been set up to be menu-driven. For example, it should ask first "What do you want to do?" You click on "Continue" and "Advisory". The menu asks "Which Zones?" You color them in. The menu asks "Is that all?" You click on "No". It asks "What else do you want to do?" You click on "Cancel" and "Advisory". The menu asks "Which Zones?" You color them in. The menu asks "Is that all?" You click on "No". It asks "What else do you want to do?" You click on "Issue", "Warning", and "Heavy Snow". The menu asks "Which Zones?" You color them in. The menu asks "How long is the Warning for?" You click on your answer. The menu asks "Is that all?" You click on "Yes". WWA then formats the message for you and puts the elements in the proper order. Under no circumstances should we have only one set of software for formatting all our messages. If the software fails, we then have no alternative but to call our sister office and have them issue the message. We should always have a second set of software, such as XNOW, to fall back on."

234. The answer is generally dissatisfaction as much as disappointment. I can get products out on WWA but it's incredibly cumbersome. Call it set up, bugs or whatever, but frequently we can't see neighboring offices products, they don't appear or update and we have trouble canceling the products (won't go away). Its easier to just create new products every 8 hours than trying to go through the editing. The display has goofing topography (red dots?) and one has to page through numerous products from various offices. As far as coordination, its not used for that. We have other means, intrasite grids and soon to be coming chat-type" discussion. We have conference calls. What's wrong with a just a plain old phone call for disscussion. I can give credit where credit is due, but the program has definately fallen toward the bottom rung of the ladder. A major, major overhaul is needed if it will ever be considered timely, helpful tool for dissemination. "
235. WWA is so difficult to use on updates that change the original areas in any way, that our standard procedure is to cancel the original watch/warning areas and start over. Considering the difficulty of software development, combining the current WWA capability with something else will probably result in an even more cumbersome procedure.
236. Comments on questions - -Ques 2 - You did a good job with the instructions sent over 2 years ago, however the instructions didn't work after about step 3 or 4. This made it very frustrating to the staff. Since then the program has very slowly improved. -Ques 5 - The GUI is quite adequate for now. However with about 125 field offices, you will have a 125 different ways of doing things. If 10 offices want something done one way and the other 115 offices want it done another way, then you will have to make that parameter configurable - which will make it a configuration nightmare for you. But how will you know unless you poll the field? -Ques 6 - A lot of field offices have had trouble deciphering the text template list written by Jim Ramer. Examples would have been helpful. Never knew when or where 'test_both' and 'area_handling' qualifiers could be used. Neither qualifier are in any national templates to see how they are applied. I guess the field should be thankful for the abstract info Mr. Ramer supplied. -Ques 7 - Conceptually yes, as long as we can keep the old programs for backup. Hate to see Warnngen get hashed. -Ques 9 - Let me guess - out of 125 offices, no one answered a, b, or c.
237. After using WWA it is obvious that the program developers have little, if any, operational field forecasting experience and have no understanding as to the needs of the field forecaster. WWA consistently fails to allow product updates or follow-ups, is extremely difficult to use, especially during periods in which time is lacking, and totally lacks a clear and understandable user interface. The user should not have to memorized the order" of a segemented product, WWA should automatically formate segemented products into the proper order. A field forecasters should never have 3 different dissemination programs for their meteorological and hydrology products. the field needs only one dissemination system, one that works, one that is easily understood, and that "one" is not WWA."
238. It is difficult to issue followup statements, especially if you want to start with the previously issued statement.
239. We use WWA operationally for watches/advisories/statements, etc and have been doing so for almost 2 years. For our staff, they find clearing/cancelling/following up to be most difficult (time consuming, multiple steps, have to get to it before previous product expires, can not make last minute adjustments easily). I'm concerned with how VTEC is going to change the way we use WWA right now (most of the staff do not follow up/clear/cancel, they just issue a new WWA each time). I have set up WWA to create nowcasts, but still prefer to use XNOW because it is faster. Time is of the essence in weather situations, and WWA just takes longer...more steps, slower start-up, etc. When I was the IFPS focal point, I was tasked with setting up WWA and training the staff. I had very little info to work from (this was almost 2 years ago), and had to spend many hours searching on the internet and playing with the software to come up with reasonable training for the staff. I had created a segmented product called TEST" in the menus that created a work file. Staff could practice whenever they wanted and were able to go through the WHOLE process of creating, segmenting, cancelling, following-up,etc, without worrying about products going out accidentally or bothering other offices. Now with the standardized menus, I can no longer do this, and much of my training material had to be thrown out...BAD! I see the point of needing to standardize menus, but we also need test products or a test mode. Staff needs a way to practice periodically, both normal operations and office backup. No formal training is available for focal points who need to customize templates and change them as new directives come out. I spend a lot of extra

time helping our office focal point, and occasionally help other offices as well. Our staff has made the transition to WWA, but one of our neighboring offices refuses to use it...kinda defeats one of the selling points I used to our staff (coordination). Related to question 3...we usually find out about changes to WWA through the AWIPS release notes, or sifting through many emails from the WWA listserver...we have to go hunt them down. I don't always have the time to do that, and our focal point doesn't always seem to get the info (he is on the listserver and on regional list of focal points) One recent experience...AWIPS build 5.2.2 we just received. The evening of the upgrade, the staff tried to issue a wind advisory, which had worked just fine before the 5.2.2 upgrade. Staff was unable to issue through WWA and had to go to XNOW, because WWA kept giving an error message for no template found. It turned out the the Marine Wind Advisory (?) template was not defined in our WWA configuration (never had to worry about that one before and never even noticed one was missing)! Even though our Wind Advisory NPW template was indeed defined and set up correctly, WWA would not "see" it until we defined a marine wind advisory template. I suspect this goes back to something from a couple builds ago that our focal point did not get word about. I guess to sum it up...We would like to see formal training for focal points, and more training materials to bring back and train the staff. We also need "Practice" products that would allow staff to go through the WHOLE process, including following up, cancelling, extending, etc, without causing trouble for CRS and surrounding offices. It would be nice to see the configuration GUI separated from the IFPS configuration (less steps to start up, no need for IFPS password). "

240. WWA works fine for simple meteorological situations. In more complex situations, i.e., updates or changes to previous issuances, the software is extremely cumbersome if not impossible to use.
241. One of the problems that I have with it is when you are composing a product I sometimes forget to check the expiration time. I wish there could be a way that it could look at the finished product before it displays in the viewer for all the world to see. By not getting the expiration time correct before you edit the product, it may expire in the viewer before you wanted it.
242. The shifts I have worked recently have not required use of WWA, so my knowledge base is somewhat limited. Updates always have been quite cumbersome with WWA, and the steps required to accomplish updates are not intuitively obvious. Lack of a true practice mode allowing the user to exercise all options, including updates, is a major deficiency. Issuance of headlines is a relatively infrequent occurrence, and it is extremely easy even for an operational forecaster to forget all of the idiosyncrasies of WWA between events. It is even worse for those of us who work shifts infrequently.
243. Extremely cumbersome and not intuitive, mainly in the area of adding and removing counties for various advisories when updating an existing advisory. XNOW is so easy to use when issuing products and changing areas, but WWA does not seem logically laid out. And then there is the terminology, like trying to remember the difference between clear and cancel, things like that. Also, once you go through all the headaches of issuing something with WWA, all it really does is to give you a headline and the UGC thing, with no other text. Many times it is extremely helpful to have the text which was issued from the previous statement, because quite often there are only minor changes. XNOW does this. In my mind, I sometimes feel like why should I hassle with WWA"? I know it will ultimately give consistency among products. I think with some work, WWA will come into its own. But after years of XNOW, it is difficult to accept WWA. Please put in a practice mode so we can play with it offline. For instance, I cannot practice issuing a followup statement if an original statement is not issued, but it is the followup routine which, to me at least, is so confusing. Thanks for asking for our comments! I appreciate the opportunity to let you know what I think!"
244. I would like to see WWA templates operate in the same way as WarnGen templates do. For instance, in non-segmented products, \$\$ have to be included to turn product off for NWR formation. WarnGen templates allow you to place at end and after localization, it shows up. This does not happen with WWA. You have to use some cloak and dagger techniques to accomplish the end result.
245. it needs to be more user friendly. I find XNOW very easy to use and wish WWA would follow suit. I find the benefit of WWA is the coordination ability. Yet if it continues to be difficult to use, offices won't use it and the

January 21, 2003

coordination ability goes out the window. Our office chose not to use it this year because of this.